

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of Drawings include changes to Figs. 2-5. These sheets, which include Figs. 2-5, replace the original sheets including those Figures. In each of the Figs. 2-5, certain reference characters are more clearly and more fully noted for the various portions of certain elements they denote.

Attachments: Four replacement sheets

Four annotated sheets showing changes

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 2 November 2005. Responsive to that Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 have now been amended, and Claims 3-5 newly-inserted for further prosecution. It is believed that with such amendment and insertion of Claims, there is a further clarification of their recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Drawings noting certain possible errors and lack of clarity in labeling. It is believed that the corrections and changes to the notation of reference character in the amended Drawings submitted herewith now obviate the Examiner's concerns.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for not being supported by a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility. More specifically, the Examiner stated that the Specification does not make clear how a power source wire is supplied to the circuit board, nor how the power is supplied in turn from the circuit board to the main body. The Examiner also rejected Claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for much the same reasons, but did not specifically set forth a substantive rejection of the Claims.

Certain of the Drawings as originally filed are hereby amended to more clearly and correctly indicate the various disclosed elements by their corresponding reference characters. Such clearer notation of the reference characters removes the apparent confusion encountered by the Examiner in correlating, for instance, the circuit diagram of Figs. 3 and 4 with the structural views shown in Figs. 2 and 5.

For consistency with the Drawings, the paragraph at page 4, lines 3-21 is also amended to make reference to the “other power source wire” by its correct reference character 60' rather than the reference character 60 incorrectly noted previously therefor.

The corrections to the Drawings specifically include, among other things, notation of the conductive portions of the circuit schematic diagrams illustrated in Figs. 3-4 which correspond to the plurality of insertion holes 21 and insertion rods 34 represented in Figs. 2 and 5. The Drawings corrections also include notation of the reference characters 60, 60' appropriately at the input terminals labeled “AC in” in the circuit schematics of Figs. 3-4, making clear that these input terminals were properly labeled (as the Examiner had surmised that these terminals should have been labeled “AC out”). In addition, the output terminal incorrectly noted by the reference character “36” is now corrected to be noted by the correct reference character “22.”

Support for correlation of the various conductive portions illustrated in the schematic diagrams to the structural features illustrated in the other Figs. is found in part at page 3, lines 20-22 which states that the “circuit board 30 is used for connection between the overload protector and the main body 20.” The Specification goes on to explain in light of the Drawing Figs. that “[s]everal insertion rods 34 and through holes 35 are provided on the circuit board 30,” and that the “insertion rods 34 ... are inserted into the insertion holes 21 of the main body,” with the “through holes 35 of the circuit board 30 ... coincid[ing] with the electric wire insertion holes 22 of the main body 20.” This suitably enables a circuit to be formed “between the circuit board and the main body,” (page 4, lines 1-6).

The changes in reference character notations in the Drawings serve to remove potential confusion and preserve consistency between the Drawing Figs. as originally

filed. As such, the amendments incorporated into the Drawings, as is the correction incorporated into the Specification, purely formal in nature, having full support in the Specification and Drawings as originally filed.

It is believed that such amendments to the Specification and Drawings now address the points of confusion set forth by the Examiner. It is believed, therefore, that these amendments now obviate the Examiner's formal concerns under both 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

It is believed that the subject Patent Application has now been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: 3/1/2006

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586




FIG. 2




FIG. 3




FIG. 4




FIG. 5